



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025-1030

COPY MAILED

MAY 11 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Matthew A. Hayduk
Application No. 10/017,047
Filed: December 13, 2001
Attorney Docket Number: 42390P12401
Title of Invention: Computing System Capable
of Reducing Power Consumption by
Distributing Execution of Instruction Across
Multiple Processors and Method Therefore

ON PETITION.

This is a decision on the petition filed May 1, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.137(a) to revive the above-identified application.

The petition to revive under 37 CFR § 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR § 1.137(a)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This above-identified application became abandoned for failure to timely file a proper reply to a final Office Action pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.113. The final Office Action was mailed on August 1, 2005 and set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. An amendment was submitted on November 1, 2005. In response to the amendment an Advisory Action was mailed on February 14, 2006 indicating the amendment submitted on November 1, 2005 did not place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on November 2, 2005. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on March 28, 2006.

PETITION TO REVIVE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.137(a)

A grantable petition under 37 CFR § 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply,¹
- (2) the petition fee,
- (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable, and
- (4) a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed on or before June 8, 1995 or if the application is a design application.

The instant petition lacks items (3).

As to item (3), the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 CFR §1.137(a).

The Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." See, 37 CFR § 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business."); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2D 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).² Specifically, an application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office.³

Petitioner argues the application was unavoidably delayed because the 1) USPTO incurred a three month delay in forwarding applicant's after final amendment to the

¹ In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

² See MPEP 711(c) (III) (c) (2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay.

³ Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887).

examiner, 2) applicant was never made aware of the status of application until after the six month statutory reply period, and 3) applicant was misled by the examiner. Petitioner insist that he contacted the examiner on January 24, 2006, and was informed that the reply period would be reset or extended to allow petitioner to respond to the next Office communication. Petitioner contends but for his good faith reliance on the examiner's recommendations and verbal commitment to reset the reply period, a response would have been filed prior to February 1, 2006.

Petitioner's arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive. Petitioner was informed in the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action that the statutory time period for reply could not be extended beyond the six months from the mailing of the Final Office Action. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 (b), the admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after a final rejection, a final action, an action closing prosecution, or any related proceedings will not operate to relieve the application or patent under reexamination from its condition as subject to appeal or to save the application from abandonment under § 1.135, or the reexamination from termination. Further MPEP 711.03 (c) is clear that an amendment after final rejection will not operate to avoid abandonment of the application in the absence of a timely and proper appeal, when the applicant simply permits the maximum extendable statutory period for reply to expire while awaiting a notice of allowance or other action.

Petitioner's contention that the purported verbal commitment made by the examiner made the delay unavoidable is not convincing. A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (A) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from USPTO employees; or (B) the USPTO's failure to advise the applicant of any deficiency in sufficient time to permit the applicant to take corrective action. See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985).

Accordingly, petitioner has failed to provide sufficient arguments that warrant the finding of unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.137(a).

There is no indication that the person signing the present petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the present petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent and change of correspondence address must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the present petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Alternative Venue

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition to revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required reply, the required petition fee (\$750.00 for small entity, \$1500 for other than small entity), and a statement that the **entire** delay

in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional.

The filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed, and therefore, must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b).


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300

By delivery service: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
(FedEx, UPS, DHL, etc.) Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3215.



Charlema R. Grant
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

cc: Stuart A. Whittington
OC2-157
4500 S. Dobson Road
Chandler, AZ 85248